

न त्वेवाहं जातु नासं न त्वं नेमे जनाधिपाः ।

न चैव न भविष्यामः सर्वे वयमतः परम् ॥ 12 ॥

12. There never was a time when I did not exist, nor you, nor any of these kings of men. Nor will there be any time in future when all of us shall cease to be.

अहं सर्वेश्वरः तावद् अतो वर्तमानात् पूर्वस्मिन् अनादौ काले न नासम् अपि तु आसम् । त्वन्मुखाः च एते ईशितव्याः क्षेत्रज्ञा न नासन् अपि त्वासन् । अहं च यूयं च सर्वे वयमतः परम् अस्माद् अनन्तरे काले न चैव न भविष्यामः अपि तु भविष्याम एव ।

यथा अहं सर्वेश्वरः परमात्मा नित्य इति न अत्र संशयः, तथैव भवन्तः क्षेत्रज्ञा आत्मानः अपि नित्या एव इति मन्तव्याः ।

एवं भगवतः सर्वेश्वराद् आत्मनां परस्परं च भेदः पारमार्थिकः, इति भगवता एव उक्तम् इति प्रतीयते । अज्ञानमोहितं प्रति तन्निकृत्तये पारमार्थिकनित्यत्वोपदेशसमये 'अहम्' 'त्वम्' 'इमे' 'सर्वे' 'वयम्' इति व्यपदेशात् ।

औपाधिकात्मभेदवादे हि आत्मभेदस्य अतात्त्विकत्वेन तत्त्वोपदेशसमये भेदनिर्देशो न संगच्छते ।

भगवदुक्तात्मभेदः स्वाभाविकः, इति श्रुतिः अपि आह—'नित्यो नित्यानां चेतनश्चेतनानामेको बहूनां यो विदधाति कामान् ।' (श्वेता० ६।१३) इति । नित्यानां बहूनां चेतनानां य एकः चेतनो नित्यः स कामान् विदधाति इत्यर्थः । अज्ञानकृतभेददृष्टिवादे तु परमपुरुषस्य परमार्थदृष्टेः निर्विशेषकूटस्थनित्यचैतन्यात्मयाथात्म्यसाक्षात्कारात् निवृत्ताज्ञानतत्कार्यतया अज्ञानकृतभेददर्शनं तन्मूलोपदेशादिव्यवहाराः च न संगच्छन्ते ।

अथ परमपुरुषस्य अधिगताद्वैतज्ञानस्य बाधितानुवृत्तिरूपम् इदं भेदज्ञानं दग्धपटादिवत् न बन्धकम् इति उच्येत, न एतद् उपपद्यते; मरीचिकाजलज्ञानादिकं हि बाधितम् अनुवर्तमानम् अपि न जलाहरणादिप्रवृत्तिहेतुः । एवम् अत्र अपि अद्वैतज्ञानेन बाधितं भेदज्ञानम् अनुवर्तमानम् अपि मिथ्यार्थविषयत्वनिश्चयात् न उपदेशादिप्रवृत्तिहेतुः भवति । न च ईश्वरस्य पूर्वम् अज्ञस्य शास्त्राधिगततत्त्वज्ञानतया बाधितानुवृत्तिः शक्यते वक्तुम्; 'यः सर्वज्ञः सर्ववित्' (मु०उ० २।१।९) परास्य शक्तिर्विविधैव श्रूयते स्वाभाविकी ज्ञानबलक्रिया च ।' (श्वेता० ६।८) 'वेदाहं समतीतानि वर्तमानानि चार्जुन । भविष्याणि च भूतानि मां तु वेद न कश्चन ॥' (गीता ७।२६) इति श्रुतिस्मृतिविरोधात् ।

किं च परमपुरुषश्च इदानीन्तनगुरुपरम्परा च अद्वितीयात्मस्वरूपनिश्चये सति अनुवर्तमाने अपि भेदज्ञाने स्वनिश्चयानुरूपम् अद्वितीयम् आत्मज्ञानं कस्मै उपदिशति इति वक्तव्यम् ।

प्रतिबिम्बवत्प्रतीयमानेभ्यः अर्जुनादिभ्यः इति चेत्, न एतद् उपपद्यते; न हि अनुमत्तः

कोऽपि मणिकृपाणदर्पणादिषु प्रतियमानेषु स्वात्मप्रतिबिम्बेषु तेषां स्वात्मनः अनन्यत्वं जानन् तेभ्यः कम्पि अर्थम् उपदिशति ।

बाधितानुवृत्तिः अपि तैः न शक्यते वक्तुम्; बाधकेन अद्वितीयात्मज्ञानेन आत्मव्यतिरिक्तभेदज्ञानकारणस्य अज्ञानादेः विनष्टत्वात् । द्विचन्द्रज्ञानादौ तु चन्द्रैकत्वज्ञानेन पारमार्थिकतिमिरादिदोषस्य द्विचन्द्रज्ञानहेतोः अविनष्टत्वाद् बाधितानुवृत्तिः युक्ता । अनुवर्तमानम् अपि प्रबलप्रमाणबाधितत्वेन अकिञ्चित्करम् । इह तु भेदज्ञानस्य सविषयस्य सकारणस्य अपारमार्थिकत्वेन वस्तुयाथात्म्यज्ञानविनष्टत्वात् न कथंचिद् अपि बाधितानुवृत्तिः संभवति । अतः सर्वेष्वरस्य इदानीन्तनगुल्परम्परायाः च तत्त्वज्ञानम् अस्ति चेद् भेददर्शन-तत्कार्योपदेशाद्यसंभवः । भेददर्शनमस्ति इति चेद्, अज्ञानस्य तद्धेतोः स्थितत्वेन अज्ञत्वाद् एव सुतराम् उपदेशो न संभवति ।

किं च गुरोः अद्वितीयात्मविज्ञानाद् एव ब्रह्माज्ञानस्य सकार्यस्य विनष्टत्वात् शिष्यं प्रति उपदेशो निष्प्रयोजनः । गुरुः तज्ज्ञानं च कल्पितम् इति चेत्, शिष्यतज्ज्ञानयोः अपि कल्पितत्वात् तदपि अनिवर्तकम् । कल्पितत्वेऽपि पूर्वविरोधित्वेन निवर्तकम् इति चेत्, तदाचार्यज्ञानेऽपि समानम् इति तद् एव निवर्तकं भवति, इति उपदेशानर्थक्यम् एव; इति कृतम् असमीचीनवादैः निरस्तैः ॥ १२ ॥

Indeed, I, the Lord of all, who is eternal, was never non-existent, but existed always. It is not that these selves like you, who are subject to My Lordship, did not exist; you have always existed. It is not that 'all of us', I and you, shall cease to be 'in the future', i.e., beyond the present time; we shall always exist. Even as no doubt can be entertained that I, the Supreme Self and Lord of all, am eternal, likewise, you (Arjuna and all others) who are embodied selves, also should be considered eternal.

The foregoing implies that the difference between the Lord, the sovereign over all, and the individual selves, as also the differences among the individual selves themselves, are real. This has been declared by the Lord Himself. For, different terms like 'I', 'you', 'these', 'all' and 'we' have been used by the Lord while explaining the truth of eternality in order to remove the misunderstanding of Arjuna who is deluded by ignorance.

[Now follows a refutation of the Upādhi theory of Bhās-

kara and the Ignorance theory of the Advaitins which deny any ultimate difference between the Lord and the Jīvas.]

If we examine (Bhaskara's) theory of Upādhis (adjuncts), which states that the apparent differences among Jīvas are due to adjuncts, it will have to be admitted that mention about differences is out of place when explaining the ultimate truth, because the theory holds that there are no such differences in reality. But that the differences mentioned by the Lord are natural, is taught by the Śruti also: 'Eternal among eternal, sentient among sentients, the one, who fulfils the desires of the many' (Śve.U.VI.13, Ka.U.V.13).

The meaning of the text is: Among the eternal sentient beings who are countless, He, who is the Supreme Spirit, fulfils the desires of all.'

As regards the theory of the Advaitins that the perception of difference is brought about by ignorance only and is not really real, the Supreme Being—whose vision must be true and who, therefore must have an immediate cognition of the differenceless and immutable and eternal consciousness as constituting the nature of the Ātman in all authenticity, and who must thereby be always free from all ignorance and its effects—cannot possibly perceive the so-called difference arising from ignorance. It is, therefore, unimaginable that He engages himself in activities such as teaching, which can proceed only from such a perception of differences arising from ignorance.

The argument that the Supreme Being, though possessed of the understanding of non-duality, can still have the awareness of such difference persisting even after sublation, just as a piece of cloth may have been burnt up and yet continues to have the appearance of cloth, and that such a continuance of the sublated does not cause bondage—such an argument is invalid in the light of another analogy of a similar kind, namely, the perception of the mirage, which, when understood to be what it is, does not make one endeavour to fetch water therefrom. In the same way even

if the impression of difference negated by the non-dualistic illumination persists, it cannot impel one to activities such as teaching; for the object to whom the instruction is to be imparted is discovered to be unreal. The idea is that just as the discovery of the non-existence of water in a mirage stops all effort to get water from it, so also when all duality is sublated by illumination, no activity like teaching disciples etc., can take place.

Nor can the Lord be conceived as having been previously ignorant and as attaining knowledge of unity through the scriptures, and as still being subject to the continuation of the stultified experiences. Such a position would stand in contradiction to the Śruti and the Smṛti: 'He, who is all-comprehender' (Muṇ.U., 1.1.9); all knower and supreme and natural power of varied types are spoken of in Śrutis, such as knowledge, strength and action' (Śve.U.6.8); 'I know, Arjuna, all beings of the past, present and future but no one knows Me,' etc. (Gītā 7.26).

And again, if the perception of difference and distinction are said to persist even after the unitary Self has been decisively understood, the question will arise—to whom will the Lord and the succession of teachers of the tradition impart the knowledge in accordance with their understanding? The question needs an answer. The idea is that knowledge of non-duality and perception of differences cannot co-exist. If it be replied by Advaitins holding the Bimba-Pratibimba (the original and reflections) theory that teachers give instructions to their own reflections in the form of disciples such as Arjuna, it would amount to an absurdity.

For, no one who is not out of his senses would undertake to give any instruction to his own reflections in mediums such as a precious stone, the blade of a sword or a mirror, knowing, as he does, that they are non-different from himself. The theory of the persistence of the sublated is thus impossible to maintain, as the knowledge of the unitary self

destroys the beginningless ignorance in which differences falling outside the self are supposed to be rooted. 'The persistence of the sublated' does occur in cases such as the vision of the two moons, where the cause of the vision is the result of some real defect in eyesight, not removable by the right understanding of the singleness of the moon. Even though the perception of the the two moons may continue, the sublated cognition is rendered inconsequential on the strength of strong contrary evidence. For, it will not lead to any activity appropriate for a real experience.

But in the present context (i.e., the Advaitic), the conception of difference, whose object and cause are admittedly unreal, is cancelled by the knowledge of reality. So the 'persistence of the sublated' can in no way happen. Thus, if the Supreme Lord and the present succession of preceptors have attained the understanding of (Non-dual) reality, their perception of difference and work such as teaching proceeding from that perception, are impossible. If, on the other hand, the perception of difference persists because of the continuance of ignorance and its cause, then these teachers are themselves ignorant of the truth, and they will be incapable of teaching the truth.

Further, as the preceptor has attained the knowledge of the unitary self and thereby the ignorance concerning Brahman and all the effects of such ignorance are thus annihilated, there is no purpose in instructing the disciple. If it is held that the preceptor and his knowledge are just in the imagination of the disciple, the disciple and his knowledge are similarly the product of the imagination of the preceptor, and as such can not put an end to the ignorance in question. If it is maintained that the disciple's knowledge destroys ignorance etc., because it contradicts the antecedent state of non-enlightenment, the same can be asserted of the preceptor's knowledge. The futility of such teachings is obvious. Enough of these unsound doctrines which have all been refuted.